IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.368 OF 2002

Sudhir Yashvant Karanjkar ...Applicant

Vs.

Santosh S/o Narayan Munde
& Anr. ...Respondents

Shri. R.A. Karale for the Applicant.
Ms M.H. Deshmukh, A.P.P. for the Respondent No.1.
Ms Rajshree Gadhvi, A.P.P. for the Respondent No.2.

CORAM : A.S.OKA, J.
DATED : JULY 26, 2005.

P.C.:

1. Heard learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant and the learned A.P.P. for the State. The learned A.P.P. for the State pointed out that the State has not taken a decision to file appeal against the acquittal.

2. Perusal of the notes of evidence and impugned judgment and order shows that there is no perversity in the impugned judgment and order. The learned Judge has disbelieved the prosecution story as narrated by the first informant Sudhir. The learned Judge noted that though the said Sudhir knew the accused very well, he did not disclose before the police that the motorcycle was being driven by the Accused. There is no explanation as to why he did not disclose the name of the accused in the F.I.R. lodged by him.

3. After appreciating oral and documentary evidence on record, the learned Judge has discarded

the evidence of first informant Sudhir. There is no manifest error of law. Hence, no interference is called for in this Revision Application and the Application is rejected.

JUDGE